REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended to make a minor correction.

Claims 1-4 and 10-16 are present in this application, claims 5, 6 and 8 being canceled and claims 10-16 being added by way of the present amendment. Amended claims 1-4 and new claims 10-16 find support, for example, in Figures 25-27. It is believed that no question of introduction of new matter is raised.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over JP 04-332268 (So Jin-U). Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claim 2 is rejected over So Jin-U in view of US 6,927,797 (Gelbard), claims 5 and 6 are rejected over JP 09-127429 (Muramatsu) in view of JP 05-328179 (Yamada) and claim 8 is rejected Yamada in view of Muramatsu.

The camera according to claim 1 includes a camera body, a mounting member removably installable on a camera body, a first arm member attached to the mounting member, and a viewfinder removably installed on a first arm member. The camera according to claim 1 can provide for the viewfinder to be used as a long viewfinder.

None of the cited prior art discloses a camera having the elements of claim 1, particularly first arm member attached to the mounting member and the viewfinder removably installed on the first arm member. The only reference cited in the Office Action with regard to an arm is Gelbard. The Office Action asserts that the structure shown in Figure of Gelbard 9 which is attached to the camera body as illustrated in Figure 1. However, the rod support base 100 having a pair of rods 108 and 110 is not attached to a mounting member at a first end and attached to the viewfinder at a second end to be adjacent to a side of the camera body, the first arm extends from the mounting member towards back of the camera, and is pivotably rotatable about the mounting member at the first end and

Application No. 10/689,703

Reply to Office Action of July 12, 2007

being fixed to the viewfinder at the second end. The rods 108 and 110 do not pivot about the viewfinder.

Accordingly, the camera as recited in claim 1 is clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

It is respectfully submitted the present application is in condition for allowance and a favorable decision to that effect is respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle Attorney of Record Registration No.: 40,073

Carl E. Schlier

Registration No. 34,426

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 03/06)

I:\ATTY\CES\244211US-AM.DOC